DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 229 SP 024 988

AUTHOR Woolman, David C.
TITLE A Future Education for Peace and World Development: The True World of Johan Galtung and Educational Reconstruction.
PUB DATE Jan 84
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (64th, New Orleans, LA, January 28-February 1, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Educational Change; *Educational Philosophy; *Educational Sociology; Foreign Countries; Futures (of Society); Global Approach; Holistic Approach; Peace; *School Role; Self Actualization; Social Action; Social Change; *Social Theories; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Galtung (Johan)

ABSTRACT

A study analyzed the educational thoughts of Johan Galtung, a Norwegian social scientist, internationally respected as an educator, researcher, and political theorist. Galtung's interests in education are focused on the socio-structural role which schools perform in societies at different stages of development. An attempt was made to measure the relevance of Galtung's thought for past and present advocates of the American philosophy of educational reconstructionism. Representative publications by nine reconstructionists, representing the progression of this school of thought from the 1920s to the present, were studied and compared with Galtung's thoughts to determine similarities and differences. Findings are presented in summary format based on five research questions concerning: (1) the main elements of Galtung's thought regarding the educational structures needed to realize conditions that foster peaceful social interaction; (2) Galtung's ideas on the ends and means of the development process and its implications for educational practice; (3) the type of future world Galtung considers necessary to assure peace and social development, and how education will figure in this design; (4) strengths and weaknesses identifiable in Galtung's theories as a result of critical analysis of their conceptual and logical structures; and (5) similarities and differences between Galtung's educational ideas and those of American educational reconstructionists. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED247229

A Future Education for Peace and World Development: The True World of Johan Galtung and Educational Reconstruction

by David C. Woolman, Ph.D.

This study focuses on an analysis of the educational thought of Johan Galtung, a Norwegian social scientist who has achieved an international reputation in the fields of peace research, development studies, and futurology. Galtung is a founder of the International Peace Research Institute at the University of Oslo, Norway. He has been a professor and researcher in Europe, the United States, the Middle East, Latin America, Africa, South Asia, and the Far East. Galtung is also an advisor to many organizations concerned with educational issues, such as UNESCO, the World Health Organization, the Council of Europe, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. He has directed a transnational post-graduate study center at Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, and is a research coordinator for the United Nations University project on Goals, Processes, and Indicators of Development.

Galtung's interests in education are focused on the socio-structural role which schools play in societies at different stages of development. He is also concerned with the theoretical definition of the types of changes needed in education to achieve a future world based on conditions of peace and human development. Analysis of his ideas was based on study of the conceptual and logical framework of his thought as revealed by written documents and an interview with the subject.

SP 024 984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✗ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David C. Woolman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The study further attempted to measure the relevance of Galtung's thought for past and present advocates of the American philosophy of educational reconstructionism. Nine reconstructionists were selected, representing the progression of this school of thought from the 1920's to the present. These included Harold O. Rugg, George S. Counts, William O. Stanley, Theodore Brameld, Maxine Greene, William H. Boyer, Nobuo Shimahara, David R. Conrad, and James J. Shields, Jr. Galtung's thought was compared with that of these reconstructionists to determine the similarities and differences. Representative publications by all nine were studied. Direct feedback to Galtung's ideas was obtained by correspondence and interview with the last five above who are contemporary with Galtung. The findings are presented in summary format based on the five research questions.

1. What are the main elements of Galtung's thought regarding the educational structures needed to realize conditions that foster peaceful social interaction?

In Galtung's conception, peace is denied by educational structures which function in ways that reinforce conditions of direct and structural violence within and between societies. He perceives that western culture and its established social structures are encoded with values and processes of fragmentation, segmentation, exploitation, marginalization, and centralization which deny human values of self-fulfillment and communal socialization. According to Galtung, this social cosmology is driven by forces of imperialistic expansionism that create most observable global conditions of direct and structural violence.

The inherent conservatism of schools is cited as the major reason for their reinforcement of this negative status quo. Deficient school effects that reinforce structural violence are identified as alienation of individuals from self-realization, pressure for social uniformity, production of social inequality, inculcation of values, abilities, and interests that contribute to spiritual and material poverty, promotion of dependence on political and economic structures based on exploitation and inequity, preparation for social fragmentation through compartmentalized learning experiences, encouragement of involvement in the materialistic "bourgeois way of life," deemphasis of democratic participation by perpetuation of vertical hierarchical organization within and between all levels of staff and student relations, and reinforcement of established social interests and powers through emphasis on dissociative categorical learning and excessive order.

Galtung proposes several goals and structural changes to correct the dysfunctional relationship that he identifies between existing educational practices and peaceful social conditions. Alternative goals for school are identified as encouragement of personal growth through self-realization; greater diversity, flexibility and pluralism in the content, personnel and structure of education; promotion of social equality through equal access to education, reduction of competition, and more equal consideration for all programs; preparation for balanced socio-economic growth by training for cooperative action, non-cooperation with the exploitative economic macro-structure, and proficiency in provision of basic survival needs; learning skills of autonomy, self-reliance, and independence that result in a society

based on equity for all; development of social solidarity through a holistic knowledge base and awareness of common global class interests; training in means for experimenting with an alternative way of life based on balanced spiritual and material values; experience in egalitarian social participation based on collective organization, democratic decision-making, and genuine dialogue in social relations; and creation of new learning environments based on high levels of association, uncertainty, and entropy to encourage new integration of meaning and to counteract types of order that perpetuate vested interests and unquestioned traditional practices.

Galtung considers that change in education must be dialectically related to change in the general society. To function in this dialectic he holds that schools must maintain a linkage with social reality. For the most part, change in education is thought to result from macro-social changes; however, Galtung conceives that schools can contribute to such change by producing conditions of social disequilibrium which lead to conflict. Conflict is held to be natural and essential for all social change. However, Galtung theorizes that conditions of high entropy and high association are essential to constructively relieve the tensions produced by conflict; low entropy (order) and dissociation which allow unresolved tensions to accumulate are regarded as the cause of most destructive conflict between and within persons. His structural rearrangements of education are all efforts to encourage constructive conflict and diminish destructive conflict.

2. What are Galtung's ideas on the ends and means of the development process and its implications for educational practice?

Galtung's perspective on the ends and means of human development represents an extension and refinement of his theories about the educational structures required for peace. Current global conditions are interpreted as evidence of maldevelopment. Interactions between and within nations are held to be based on structural inequalities governed by feudal imperialistic center-periphery gradients. Education is regarded as an active reinforcer of these negative social arrangements. Evidence given for this include brain drain, educational expansion that increases social disparity, transfer of feudal education structures from center to periphery, and colonization of the periphery by academic agents of knowledge imperialism.

The society, economy, and education are held to be in a vertically structured isomorphic relationship. The ideology and structure of education is further interpreted as a function of the stage of social evolution as represented by feudal, liberal, and revolutionary models. The particular relationship between the economy and education is thought to result from a blend of synchronic and diachronic forces. Current global development options are described in terms of a dichotomy of alpha (hierarchical, center-dependent, economic oriented growth) versus beta (egalitarian, self-reliant, multidimensional growth) structures.

Galtung perceives that schools in overdeveloped western societies mainly function as agents for inculturation of negative aspects of western culture. In this paradigm the school sorts and processes students according to the labor needs of the vertical economic struc-

ture. In western industrial democracies, tertiary education is regarded as a major factor in producing the complex of bureaucrats, capitalists, and intellectuals (BCI Complex) which is the center of a global network of imperialism and structural violence. In the Socialist bloc, a lower level of state organized education produces the complex of party, military, and police officials (PMP Complex) which functions as a center of repression and control. In the third world, educational structures transplanted from the center are regarded as contributing to the dependency, fragmentation, inequality, and marginalization that are manifested in violence, poverty, disease, and malnutrition. In general, Galtung considers western culture and social structures as an inappropriate model for third world development.

Galtung observes that the relationship of education and human development is complex. The structure and role of education are held to depend on the style of development; in this model, alpha growth emerges from vertical, formal education and beta growth from horizontal, informal education. Galtung conceives that education does influence development in various ways; for example, tertiary education is identified with societies based on BCI complexes, whereas secondary education is associated with countries run by PMP complexes. For Galtung, the content of education and the position of educational institutions in a society are the key determinants of the way education affects development. The relation of education and development is regarded as variable rather than clear cut. Increase of knowledge and alteration of the social stratification system is identified as a direct effect of education on development. The linkage of education and economic structures is held to reinforce the international center-

periphery structures; the degree of this effect is thought to depend on the level of national autonomy and the nature of the country's international relations. Galtung rejects any linear, one-way relation of education and development; he prefers a curvilinear, sophisticated relation in which impact is gauged as a function of the interrelationship of more and less developed societies.

Galtung perceives that human development depends on a transition from vertical to horizontal social organization. The role of education in this process is to contribute to the political, economic, and spiritual liberation of the periphery from the structural violence perpetrated by the center. To this end, the goals of education involve human rights, social justice, freedom, autonomy, self-reliance, equality, participation, capacity for social action, and awareness of political processes that provide and deny social welfare.

Means proposed for realizing these goals through education include dialogic and multilateral inquiry; goal-focused instruction; reliance on experience-based theory; continual transmission of theory into practice through social action and research; restructuring which makes education a process <u>of</u>, <u>for</u>, and <u>by</u> the people rather than a process of clientization; instruction in organizational skills and social values necessary to actualize a reduction in the division of labor and cooperative local self-sufficiency; deprofessionalization of teaching; redirection of teaching toward a process of guidance instead of imposition; reorganization of education as a network of alternative informal centers based on small group encounter; knowledge reform in the direction of more eclectic, integrative, interdisciplinary, multi-method styles of inquiry; and qualitative evaluation techniques that

measure horizontal education between learners, self-education, chain effects, and input/output ratios.

Galtung also conceives that application of these means would differ according to development level and needs of a particular society. In overdeveloped societies with alienation and anomie, the priority could be individual self-realization. In underdeveloped societies with poverty, disease, and poor social services the emphasis might be on collectivization, community education, and basic needs production. A major difference between his peace and development theories is his emphasis on the need for selective dissociation or delinking of peripheries from the center to avoid the domination that obstructs human development. Galtung also regards the development of global and transnational interests, reflected today in many international organizations, as a hopeful sign of the emergence of a new world order destined to transcend the dystopia created by nation-states. He maintains that transnational education delinked from national influences can be a force in reshaping the world.

3. What type of future world does Galtung consider is necessary to assure peace and social development, and how will education figure in this design?

In Galtung's view, achievement of a future world based on peace and human development requires transcendence of the present dystopia. He perceives that the future is determined by a mixture of social-historical realities and human choice. The process of transcendence is thought to require a change of attitudes and the production of conditions of social disequilibrium sufficient to create conflicts which liberate social energy for change. In overdeveloped societies this

process requires dynamism to escape the stasis resulting from the established conservative and liberal social orders. In underdeveloped societies this process requires autonomy to escape the domination of neo-colonial forces. The new future society preferred by Galtung is based on self-reliance, free association, pluralism, cooperation, high levels of social interaction, global consciousness, and the control or elimination of competition. He regards a dynamic and balanced mixture of alpha and beta structures as the best social order for realizing these goals.

Education is perceived to have the potential, in association with other social institutions, to influence the human choices and structures that shape the future. The reconception of education as a lifelong process for all humans and the breakup of the linear life cycle of childhood-education-work-retirement are held to be major needs in a future free of structural violence. In this new education, age mixing would occur at all levels and ability would be perceived as an equal potential in every learner. The role of education would be to encourage creativity, experimentation, imagination, and diversity.

Social organization is regarded as a major factor in the conversion of education into a positive future force. Galtung perceives that countervailing force is always necessary to change an established order. Examples proposed for education include coordinated teacher-student action for change; local district autonomy; focus on regional centers as the source of change; and student non-violent action such as boycott of exams, withdrawal from activities, and non-cooperation with processes contaminated by structural violence. School reorganization would include diversification, informal structures, decentral-

ization, horizontal interaction, flexible programming, community involvement, democratization of decision-making, and transnational arrangements with multinational students and teachers.

Future study is a major means for education to affect attitudes and future choices. Galtung identifies two possibilities. On the one hand, prescriptive future study involves constructivism, which permits creation of imaginary futures based on achievement of desired social goals. Galtung notes that the existence of such conceptions can lead to future realization through the logic of the self-fulfilling prophecy. Action research and social experimentation are identified as mechanisms to foster such achievement of goals. On the other hand, predictive research which uses a mixture of empirical and projective techniques is held to be useful as a mapping device to discriminate desired and undesired future worlds. In future study, the main criterion for knowledge selection is thought to be social utility. Likewise, the main criterion for teachers is held to be authenticity, which involves making sure that actions are consistent with words.

4. What strengths and weaknesses are identifiable in Galtung's theories as a result of critical analysis of their conceptual and logical structures?

Galtung's thought represents an effort at theory building in the normative areas of peace research, development studies, and futurology. He employs an eclectic mixture of conceptual and logical elements from the social and physical sciences and philosophical humanism. Major features of his theory include structural functional analysis, condition-consequence relationships, mathematical logic, typology construction, analogy, integration, and dialectical processes.

Hypothetical deductive logic is used to apply laws from physical and social sciences to the description and interpretation of social organization. Systems analysis and ideal types are also used to explicate the patterns and dynamics of social structures.

Strengths of Galtung's theory include grounding in concepts based on such observable phenomena as social stratification, center-periphery structures, and inequality; epistemic dualism that combines reason with empirical study and contingent relativism with structural determinism; concrete applications of value assertions through experimental, empirical, and observational procedures; use of qualification to delimit the range and effects of concepts; justification of value concepts through reference to utilitarian, instrumental, contributory, and welfare criteria; an operational structure whereby concepts are translated into action or process components; value choices based on defensible partiality; denial of universalism which obstructs social dynamism; and systematic interconnection of conceptual structures on the basis of general laws of social change.

Weaknesses of Galtung's theory include simultaneous assertion of contradictory states, such as stasis and disequilibrium or determinism and dynamism; inadequate coverage of the problem of transfer of meaning from macro to micro levels; lack of independent verification of elements in condition-consequence relationships; insufficient treatment of means whereby theory is converted into practice; broad generalization which misses local variations; lack of clarity and definitional refinement in concepts like men being both innate and environmentally determined; exclusion of potentially useful methodologies such as empiricism and study of the past; unintended consequences

such as equality producing more competition, or inequality and high entropy causing stress, competition, and accelerated death rates; and neglect of the problem of how to sustain conflict if the establishment of positive peace were to remove the causes for conflict, such as inequality and injustice.

5. What are the similarities and differences between Galtung's educational ideas and those of American educational reconstructionists?

Reconstructionists agreed with many of Galtung's diagnoses of educational problems. These include the school's neglect of individual self-realization; social transformation; creativity; potential diversity of ability; democratic values; holistic knowledge; full student participation; community involvement; and the need for political action. Like Galtung, reconstructionists were critical of the school's emphasis on excessive social conformity and enculturation; support of the economic and political status quo; sorting of students by testing; programs that reinforce inequal ability; middle class standards; fragmentation of knowledge; imposition as a style of curriculum, teaching and administration; hierarchical bureaucratic organization; and avoidance of political controversy.

Reconstructionists also agreed with Galtung on many prescriptions for educational reform. Agreements on goals include greater equality of access; democratic socialization; focus on analysis and resolution of social problems; greater diversity of programs; promotion of natural resource conservation; linkage of the school with reconstructive forces in society; creative expression; and experiences that relate to attainment of basic material and spiritual needs.

Agreements on educational content needs include greater variety of sources and inputs; future constructivism; critical study of the impact of nationalism on global welfare; reinterpretation of social studies from a global perspective; thorough treatment of the meaning of human development; more interdisciplinary studies; balance of empirical and creative activity; integrated approaches to the study of social reality; more generalization; less specialization; and study of principles and issues involved in conflict resolution, social justice, economic welfare, and ecological survival. Agreements on structural changes in education include non-authoritarian teaching styles; more democratic decision making; diversification of programs and types of schools; dialogic pedagogy based on genuine two-way interaction; interface between school programs and societal trends that maximize the opportunity for schools to promote social change; pluralistic methodologies to increase learner associations and facilitate truth seeking; action research and learning based on experimental application of ideas to community problems and political issues; construction of school programs on the basis of a full consideration of their socio-political implications; and reduction of the heavy emphasis on testing, grading, and sorting procedures which make competition more motivating than learning and self-development.

Reconstructionists and Galtung also differed in many significant respects in their diagnosis of educational problems and recommendations for reform. Galtung proposes alternatives to western education and culture, whereas reconstructionists favor cultural transmission and reform within existing institutions. Galtung maintains a negative image of schooling, whereas reconstructionists perceive that the

schools are quite diversified depending on variables like teacher commitment, program, parent support, and administrative flexibility. Galtung stresses structural determinism as the main factor in social formations, whereas the reconstructionists emphasize individual action as a major source of social change. Galtung puts heavy emphasis on the social structure as the key to change, whereas reconstructionists identify other factors like legal structure, the power structure, and national ideologies as salient. Galtung holds that change requires disequilibrium and countervailing force, but reconstructionists focus mainly on change with continuity. Galtung considers compulsory schooling alien to learning, whereas reconstructionists maintain that positive learning can still occur in this environment. Galtung perceives that international education transfer between unequal countries may reinforce exploitative interaction, but reconstructionists hold that such transfers can be designed to avoid inequity. Galtung considers curricular inclusion a dead-end for new ideas, but reconstructionists perceive curriculum as a means for change. Galtung would deemphasize empiriciam and increase constructivism, whereas reconstructionists favor a balanced study of past, present, and future.

The major potential implications of Galtung's thought for educational reconstructionists are the strategies of disequilibrium, countervailing force, discontinuity with established institutions, counterculture creation, selective delinking, smaller scale alternative schools, deemphasis of general mandatory education, and targeting on social structures as the key to changing social values and relations. The need for disequilibrium as a stimulus for change is recognized by several neo-reconstructionists. However, the neo-reconstructionists

do not accept the reduction of the reform focus to structural dynamics or social interaction. Nor do they accept the extremes of rejection, polarization, and social separation implied by Galtung's approach. Moreover, different neo-reconstructionists were dissatisfied with elements of anarchy, selective negativism, misplaced concreteness, overemphasis on macro-analysis, lack of realistic specific strategies to solve current social problems, and the romantic pre-nuclear socialism in Galtung's thought.

The foregoing findings reveal that Galtung's radical idealistic revolutionary position exhibits both similarities and differences with respect to the more moderate, pragmatic and evolutionary focus of the neo-reconstructionists. In general there is greater convergence on goals than on means between Galtung and the neo-reconstructionists.

Selected Bibliography

BOOKS

Galtung, Johan. "On Peace Education." In Handbook on Peace Education, pp. 153–71. Edited by Christoph Wulf. Oslo: International Peace Research Association, 1974.

_____. Schooling, Education, and the Future. Malmö, Sweden: Department of Educational and Psychological Research, School of Education, 1982.

_____. The True Worlds: A Transnational Perspective. New York: Free Press, 1980.

Galtung, Johan, Beck, Christian, and Jaastad, Johannes. Educational Growth and Educational Disparity. Current Studies and Research in Statistics (CSR.E.5). Paris: UNESCO, 1974.

ARTICLES

Galtung, Johan. "Literacy, Education, and Schooling—For What?" Convergence 8(1975): 39–50.

_____. "Schooling and Future Society." School Review 83 (August 1975): 73–88.

_____. "The Dialectics of Education." Convergence 8(1975): 64–76.

_____. "Towards New Indicators of Development." Futures 8 (June 1976): 261–65.

Galtung, Johan, and Wirak, Anders Helge. "Human Needs and Human Rights: A Theoretical Approach." Bulletin of Peace Proposals 8(1977): 251–60.